



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,752	02/19/2004	Michio Nakano	H6808.0041/P041	1776
24998	7590	07/13/2007	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP 1825 EYE STREET NW Washington, DC 20006-5403			DESIRE, GREGORY M	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/13/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,752	NAKANO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory M. Desire	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 4-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/19/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldberg et al (7,106,895).

Regarding claims 1, 4 and 8 Goldberg discloses,

A plurality of processors for performing parallel processing (note col. 14 lines 38-40);

Means for cutting serial image data (note col. 14 lines 53-55, examiner interprets image of sample as serial image data) into a plurality of cutout image data (note fig. 8, block 808, dividing image examiner interprets as cutout image data), said cutout image data including forward end overlap and a rear end overlap at cutout boundaries having a predetermined data size, wherein said forward end overlap is greater than a pitch of the cell in cell to cell comparison inspection (note fig. 3, 210 and col. 7 lines 14-24),

Means for distributing said image data to said plurality of processors (note fig. 8, block 810); and

Means for assembling results of processing performed by said plurality of processors (note fig. 8, block 814),

Regarding claim 5,

Wherein each of said processor has a function program, which is configured to perform cell-to-cell comparison inspection by using, said cutout image data distributed to said processor (note col. 11 lines 23-25).

Regarding claim 6,

Wherein each of said processor has a function program, which is configured to perform die-to-die comparison inspection by using, said cutout image data distributed to said processor. (Note col. 11 lines 23-25)

Regarding claim 8,

Wherein said forward end overlap is greater than the double of said pitch of the cell in cell to cell comparison inspection and said rear end overlap is greater than said pitch of the cell.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg in view of Kuwabara (2003/0053675 A1).

Regarding claim 7,

Goldberg does not clearly disclose performing cell-to-cell and die-to-die hybrid comparison inspection by using, said cutout image data distributed to said processor. Kuwabara discloses hybrid comparison (note col. 5 paragraph 55 and 57). Goldberg and Kuwabara are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art include hybrid comparison in the system of Goldberg as evidenced by Kuwabara. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been detecting parts that may be excluded from only one comparison (note paragraph 51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goldberg with Kuwabara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 2-3 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter for claim 2. The distinguishing features are the further limiting of means for cutting serial image data to include a function, wherein the overlap according to a line address of head position of cutout image data and a cutout width, wherein said line address is less by said forward end overlap than a boundary between said image data and the preceding image data and said cutout width is the sum of said cutout image data, overlap. Claim 3 depends on claim 1. Therefore are also objected.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory M. Desire whose telephone number is (571) 272-7449. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen Lillis can be reached on (571) 272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

G.D.
July 5, 2007

GREGORY DESIRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

